DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 155 CS 008 920

AUTHOR Cook, Nancy R.; Hoag, Charles C.
TITLE On the Front Lines: A Comparison of Reading Instruction Programs in Two South Carolina Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 87
CONTRACT 400-85-1015
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987). Part of a national study, the "Whole Day Experience of the Chapter 1 Student."
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basal Reading; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Environment; Elementary Education; Institutional Characteristics; Profiles; Program Effectiveness; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Remedial Reading; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; South Carolina

ABSTRACT

A study compared reading instruction in two South Carolina public elementary schools, Sumner and Danville, that receive federal funding for remedial reading instruction under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. The two schools vary in many ways--Danville is a "traditional" school in a predominantly black urban environment, while Sumner enrolls students from a relatively well-to-do suburb and a rural poor trailer park community. Data for analysis were culled from diverse sources: questionnaires; interviews with school district Chapter 1 coordinators, principals, teachers, instructional aides, and students; and field notes on the instructional days of Chapter 1 students. Data revealed that Danville used the "pullout" model for remedial instruction, sending students to a reading lab to receive instruction from a teacher and an aide, while Sumner used "floating" aides who worked within the classrooms. Results also indicated that Sumner students received 110 minutes of reading instruction daily, of which 21 minutes was Chapter 1 service. Danville students received 145 minutes of daily reading instruction, and the average Chapter 1 class was 50 minutes long. At Sumner, instruction was mostly in the lecture/recitation format, but at Danville the format was more varied. Findings showed that both schools emphasized the basal reader series, with more time spent on lower order comprehension than on "higher order" thinking. (Tables of data are included, and references are attached.) (MKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED286155

"On the Front Lines:

A Comparison of Reading Instruction Programs in Two South Carolina Schools"

Nancy R. Cook

Charles C. Hoag

College of Education

University of South Carolina

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nancy Cook
Charles C. Hoag
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The work in this paper was supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, under contract # 400-85-1015 to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the Department of Education.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Lorin W. Anderson, Professor of Educational Leadership, University of South Carolina.

CS 008920

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper portrays the similarities and differences in reading instruction practiced in two South Carolina public elementary schools that receive Federal funding for remedial reading instruction under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA). The two schools were purposively chosen as a part of a national study, the "Whole Day Experience of the Chapter 1 Student," funded by the Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Education in South Carolina has been affected by political and historical realities, including the state's relatively low standing in education. Recent educational reforms in the state have included the Basic Skills Assessment Program, a criterion-referenced testing program in reading, writing and mathematics and the Education Improvement Act, a major legislative mandate increasing funding, creating compensatory education programs, and demanding more accountability for public schools. The two schools in this study vary in many ways, including their location, the student population and Chapter 1 reading programs. The study utilized several sources of data: questionnaires; interviews with school district Chapter 1 coordinators, principals, teachers and instructional aides, and with students; and field notes of the instructional days of Chapter 1 students. The study therefore yielded both quantitative and qualitative data. The two schools, Danville and Sumner, differ in many ways, as revealed by qualitative descriptions of the two. Danville is a "traditional" school in a predominantly black urban environment while Sumner enrolls students from a relatively well-to-do suburb and a rural poor trailer park community. Danville's Chapter 1 reading program "pulls

out" students who score in the lowest quarter of standardized reading tests to go to a reading laboratory classroom. Sumner employs instructional aides in regular classrooms to "tutor" Chapter 1 students who score below the median but above the 25th percentile. Reading instruction at both schools emphasizes the basal series but much more time is spent on lower order comprehension than on "higher order" thinking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1
II. METHODOLOGY.....3
A. The Selection of Schools and Students.....3
B. Training of Field Workers.....3
C. Data Collection.....4
III. TWO SCHOOLS.....5
A. Danville Elementary School.....5
B. Sumner Elementary School.....11
IV. RESULTS.....17
A. School Characteristics.....17
B. Design of Chapter 1 reading programs.....19
C. Characteristics of Reading Instruction.....21
V. DISCUSSION.....27
VI. REFERENCES.....28

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to portray the similarities and differences in reading instruction as practiced in two South Carolina public schools. Both schools receive Federal funding for remedial reading instruction that is aimed at "low achieving" students in educationally disadvantaged environments. The paper concentrates on the instruction of reading in the Chapter 1 reading programs for students in the second and fourth grades of these schools. The study under which this data was collected was the "Whole Day Experience of the Chapter 1 Student." This national study was coordinated by the Far West Laboratory with Brian Rowan as Principal Investigator. It was funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education. There were six sites chosen nationally to participate, including the Deep South site, coordinated by Lorin W. Anderson, Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of South Carolina. This data was collected by a team of three field workers, including USC faculty members Drs. Aretha Pigford and James Sears, as well as the first author of this paper. The people and places described herein are real but all names are pseudonyms.

To understand reading instruction as it is delivered in South Carolina today necessitates an understanding of the political and historical trends that have affected education in this state. As a poor Southern state, South Carolina was one of the major beneficiaries of the "Great Society" federal programs of the 1960's. Chapter 1 of

the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act is the transformed version of Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Its major goal is to provide remedial instruction to students in economically and socially disadvantaged areas. South Carolina schools have received millions of federal dollars in the late 1960's and the decades of the 1970's and 1980's through this single program.

The educational reform movement has touched South Carolina in many ways and continues to do so. South Carolina's relative position among the fifty states ranks it close to the bottom on many variables associated with high quality education, such as SAT scores and literacy rates. Partially, as a product of this standing, reform came to South Carolina early in the rush "back to the basics" and has been a continuing theme in the public arena. Several extensive state legislative programs were enacted beginning in the late 1970's. The Basic Skills Assessment Program (BSAP) mandated a state-wide criterion-referenced testing program for students in the first, second, third, sixth, eighth and tenth grades. The tests were based on a set of curriculum objectives in reading, writing and math defined by the State Department of Education. A second major recent legislative mandate, the Education Improvement Act of 1984 (EIA), increased financial support of schools, raised teacher salaries, provided for new efforts in the realm of compensatory and remedial instruction for students who failed to meet the objectives of the BSAP and increased accountability across the board.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. The Selection of Schools and Students

The two schools described in this paper were chosen purposively for inclusion in the national study in order to reflect some differences in their location, student population and their Chapter 1 instructional delivery model. The national study did not claim to be a statistically representative sample of Chapter 1 schools nationally. Observation of students over the course of the school day was a major task in the national study. The identification of students at the two schools was similarly purposive to include students who differed from each other on such characteristics as gender and race.

B. Training of Field Workers

Far West personnel trained the research team at each site using a standard set of materials and activities. In order to assure that field workers could collect data with sufficient objectivity, reliability and validity, one month after the training, a coding test was administered to all field workers. The results of this testing indicated that the field workers understood and could reliably use the data collection instruments.

C. Data Collection

Several methods of data collection were combined in this study in order to provide an in-depth view of the reading instructional programs at the two schools. A mini-questionnaire was completed by the school's principal on the demographic, programmatic and funding variables at the school and the district. Semi-structured interviews with the district Chapter 1 coordinators and principals provided information about the goals and objectives of the Chapter 1 reading programs, and of the instructional delivery systems in the target schools. Interviews with classroom teachers and instructional aides in reading furnished information concerning their instructional philosophy, their goals and objectives and their strategies for achieving those results. Interviews with students provided the investigators with information about students' feelings about their teachers and their achievement in reading.

The field workers observed Chapter 1 reading students at school and recorded extensive field notes concerning the schooling that these children received in all academic classes, including Chapter 1 classes, state-funded compensatory classes and regular reading classes. This paper focuses on this data. The Student Observation Instrument, developed by Far West Laboratory, included such data as time, lesson format, group size and teacher as well as the recording of events that occurred in the class as it was observed. The instrument, therefore, yielded information that was easily analyzed by computer and provided rich descriptive detail about the students' school experience.

III. TWO SCHOOLS

Because of the nature of the methodology of the study, i.e. mixing observations with interviews, the field workers were able to gain a "sense of the place." All schools have unique characteristics which are functions of where they are, who teaches at them, who the students are, and how the school functions. In this section, the paper will attempt to communicate some of these "intangibles."

A. Danville Elementary School

In the small Southern city, there are many areas like Danville, quiet streets with shabby frame houses and brick public housing apartment complexes. This isn't the ghetto, but it is not any place people choose to be either. In this predominately black area, children scoot on the streets on their skateboards while the teenage mothers spend their days tending their babies and watching the soap operas. The teenagers hang around at night but in the morning, the boys and girls who attend Danville Elementary walk, ride the school bus or con a ride to school. Breakfast is served at 7:30 and almost everyone eats breakfast, mostly for free.

Danville Elementary looks comfortable in its surroundings. Its face to the world is a 1950's red brick schoolhouse. The shade trees and shrubbery aren't polished but they fit together with the unprepossessing facade. Behind the front part is a relatively new

classroom wing with a large library media center. The halls are decorated with children's construction paper masterpieces. In the middle is the lunchroom with a stage at one end. In the lunchroom in the morning are children. From the four and five year old kindergarten to the fifth grade "seniors," the children eat and talk while some teachers roam the lunchroom and others sit together at the teachers table, talking about people, news and generally gearing up for another day.

In many ways, Danville personifies the type of district and school in the urban South that Chapter 1 has served since its inception. Approximately one quarter of the people in the district in which Danville is located are considered "poverty level." In Danville, over 50% of the students receive either "free" or "reduced price" meals. In the desegregated South, Danville's enrollment is 90% black, 10% white.

Danville's faculty is a mix. They range from several black teachers who have taught at Danville for over 15 years since the days that this was a "de jure" segregated school to some young teachers, wives of husbands with professional careers that have led them here to the city. For example, one young teacher, whose second grade classroom includes most of the Chapter 1 reading students, is married to a university assistant professor.

The Chapter 1 reading program includes 2 teachers and 2 instructional aides. One of the Chapter 1 reading teachers at Danville has been teaching Federally funded remedial reading here since the 1960's when what was then Title I first began. She laughingly terms herself a "vete-an of the wars." Her aide is similarly experienced and they function with the ease that long years of cooperative work brings. The second Chapter 1 reading teacher is much younger. She brings to her work a high level of professional preparation including specialized reading graduate training. Her aide has less experience and little formal post-secondary education. Their relationship is more formal and the teacher directs her aide fairly specifically. One concern of this teacher was to make appropriate use of her aide.

The principal of Danville is a seasoned professional who has held this principalship for over 10 years. She is very concerned with all the members of the Danville "family," faculty, staff and children. She terms herself a "traditionalist" who is determined that "her" teachers control the behavior of the students and "cover the material." She reflects the education reform of South Carolina in her concerns that the instruction at Danville make students "pass" standardized tests, both the state criterion-referenced reading and math tests (the BSAP) but also the norm-referenced Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). The principal is very aware of the problems that are found in the typical home background of her students. Instructionally, she

believes that selection of teachers is one of her major leadership functions. She believes that Chapter 1 and regular reading are well-coordinated because of the "split" in activities that is the rule in reading instruction at Danville.

Second graders at Danville spend almost all of their school time in a self-contained classroom that is more or less homogeneously grouped by achievement criteria. Ms. Hoffman, the second grade teacher with the "low" section, has all but one of the Chapter 1 students in her classroom. Ms. Hoffman groups her class into three reading groups for instruction and uses different readers in the basal series to teach each group. She follows the basal teaching guide fairly strictly and usually spends approximately one week on a story unit.

In the fourth grade, the students are no longer self-contained. They change classes. One fourth grade teacher is primarily responsible for math and science, a second for English and social studies and a third for reading although the reading teacher also teaches some other subjects because of scheduling. Students are escorted in groups to classrooms other than the one next door so transition between is not very time-consuming.

Chapter 1 at Danville is a "pullout" model. Being a Chapter 1 reading student at Danville means going to the reading laboratory four times a week. In second grade, the Chapter 1 students typically miss science or social studies while they are at Chapter 1. Fourth graders miss social studies. The regular reading teacher informs the Chapter 1

teachers, Ms. Ross and Ms. Roper, by the use of a form, what unit in the basal that she will be covering in order that they may "reinforce" the skills that she is teaching to her reading group.

The Chapter 1 reading laboratory is divided by a partition and each teacher is assigned specific students. This partition creates a physical effect of two discrete classrooms with two different teachers in charge but does nothing to isolate sound. Both Ms. Ross and Ms. Roper utilize the extra skills assignments suggested by the basal series. Each teacher works with one instructional aide exclusively. Although they communicate with each other to gain ideas or advice in the teachers lounge or lunchroom, in no sense do they collaborate in their instruction.

Ms. Ross has taught Chapter 1 reading at Danville since the program began in the late 1960's. She utilizes extra supplementary materials purchased by Chapter 1 funds that are related to the skills that the basal unit is emphasizing that week. These materials include games, word activities, consumable student materials and various media such as tapes and visuals. In the laboratory, Ms. Ross usually alternates working with her aide, Ms. Stephens, with small groups of the total which averages about 12 students. Ms. Stephens assists in the grading of papers and the maintenance of the laboratory classroom as well as working some with students. Ms. Ross does, however, do almost all of the direct instruction in the laboratory.

Ms. Roper has taught only two years at Danville, but taught Chapter 1 in her previous teaching job. Ms. Roper has pursued graduate work in the teaching of reading and is very well qualified in a formal educational sense to do this work. She, like her colleague, plans her instruction by the "skills" that are suggested in the basal series. Although she has not amassed the large quantity of supplementary materials that her colleague has, she does seem to use the ones she has very much. Ms. Smith, her aide, does more instructional support functions, e.g. grading papers, and less interacting with the students than does her counterpart, although she does do some supervision of groups when they are engaged in independent seatwork while Ms. Roper teaches another group.

The students at Danville seem to like Chapter 1. A few voiced displeasure at missing social studies since their taste of it once a week may interest them more than the reading skills and practice that Chapter 1 emphasizes. The students did express their enjoyment of some of the activities and games that they do in Chapter 1. They also like the Chapter 1 teachers and aides (even though they do not seem to make a distinction between the two, except by the fact that the teacher is the one "in charge.")

On the whole, Danville is a pleasant "traditional" school. The reading instruction is dominated by the basal and the Chapter 1 students get supplementary instruction in the sense of extra skills development activities.

B. Sumner Elementary School

To get to Sumner Elementary from the center of the small Southern city nearby, one might think that one was going to a rural school, but Sumner is not rural. Past the perimeter shopping mall about two miles, one rides past brick gates proclaiming the entrance to Sumner Plaza. If one turns at the gate and rides down the street, one sees the new homes, some already occupied and others in construction. These are large $200,000 houses ranging in style from imitation Frank Lloyd Wright to pseudo-Williamsburg. At 8:00 in the morning, the fathers begin the drive into town in the Mercedes while the mothers, having already fixed breakfast and packed the lunchboxes, hustle the children into the Pontiac station wagons to get to school on time.

Sumner Elementary fits its surroundings as well as Danville does. It is a new "state-of-the-art" elementary school, seven years old. The grounds are landscaped and there is framed art on the hall and office walls. To the casual visitor, Sumner doesn't fit the "Chapter 1 school" mold. It seems incongruous that, in this almost palatial school setting, there should exist a program for the disadvantaged.

That impression of incongruity disappears after spending some time looking at the children coming into the school. Certainly, there are many, a majority even, dressed in designer jeans with labels prominently displayed. But there are other children here too, children apparently dressed at the factory outlets; little girls with

not-permed, not even recently washed, hair; children from the other side of the tracks. The poverty here is not as obvious but it is here nonetheless. Not two miles from the fine expensive homes of the development is another place where Sumner children come from. You must drive down a red clay graded county road to get to the trailer park but it is as much a part of the Sumner community as the upscale development. Here is found another face to the poverty of the South. Here is the white casual laborer and his family, the part-time Pentecostal preacher, the laid-off mill working mother. Here are the proverbial "red necks" of pickup trucks, rifle racks and country music. The children walk to school when it's pretty or meet the bus at the turnoff when it's not. These children are a different group from Danville but they are Chapter 1 children too. Their presence at Sumner creates an almost schizoid community that pervades instruction in this school, as surely as the cyclical welfare dependence affects Danville.

Sumner was created to accommodate predicted population growth (the school was named for that first "upscale" development). The trailer park children who had ridden the bus to the school in town were assigned there and the children of the increasing number of new home owners in the developments were also assigned there. The principal was chosen from the school from which Sumner grew and he personally chose his faculty and brought a majority of the good experienced teachers to "his" new school. Since that opening, Sumner has fulfilled all predictions but at a much faster rate than initially projected. Sumner

is crowded already although one teacher commented that when it opened, "they didn't know what to do with all the room."

Sumner's regular classrooms are physically arranged in classroom units with each classroom's door opening to a circular hall and the classrooms radiating in pie shapes from the doorway. Each classroom group is designated with a "tree" name, e.g. Oak or Pine and contains essentially one grade. The arrangement optimizes the movement of students from room to room within a group. The teachers in the group cooperate in sharing teaching materials and students all day long. At Sumner children are constantly moving. Groups within classes change rooms at an efficient continuous pace. One field worker commented on the "incredible routinization," saying "these children come and they go and I don't know how they know when and where. I just have to follow along."

In the second grade, all teachers teach a variety of subjects but the children are variously grouped such that any given teacher may teach any given child any given subject. The grouping of students is very fluid and may change in the school year. The second grade teaching team meets informally to discuss children and their progress on an almost daily basis. At times these discussions were observed to focus on one child and at others, more general instructional practices and ideas.

The classrooms in the second grade are organized so that small group instruction is easily managed. There are "centers" for listening, games and art for the children to move to in their "free time" or at certain defined periods in the day. In the second grade, the teachers spend approximately half of their direct instructional time with subgroups. The other children are given seatwork or are assigned to one of the centers while the teacher works with one subgroup.

In the fourth grade, the instruction follows much the same pattern but is somewhat closer to the "traditional." Teachers do tend to teach a limited scope of subjects and stay with the same children throughout the year. Generally there is more whole group instruction, except in the case of reading, where subgroups are routinely used.

Chapter 1 at Sumner fits into this general pattern of small group instruction and children moving around very well. The instructional delivery model for Chapter 1 reading is the "in-class" model. At Sumner, a Chapter 1 aide is assigned to specific children to help them with their reading. Usually these children are grouped together for reading instruction by the teacher. Unlike the other children who work independently while the teacher is involved with another group, the Chapter 1 aide works with the Chapter 1 students. The teacher writes out a set of assignments for the aide to do with the children in her classroom on a weekly basis. These aides "float" within the grade level classroom unit for their average half-day work day.

Chapter 1 aides at Sumner are unusual according to the district Chapter 1 coordinator and the administration. They are, for the most part, fairly well educated mothers of young children who wish to work in a school setting. Some are college graduates who lack teaching certificates. Others attended college but did not finish. The principal stated that his minimum educational criterion for hiring an aide was 2 years of college and that he would prefer a college graduate.

The aides' responsibility is to reinforce the reading skills that the teacher directly taught in the basal lesson. In some senses, it is a tutoring process. At times, the aide will work with only one Chapter 1 student, at others she will work with 4-5. Some aides only follow the teaching guide to do this reinforcement. Others are more creative and use other instructional materials, even some of their own creation. Some aides expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of responsibility and freedom. One said "I just do what she (the teacher) puts on the sheet." Others feel that the lack of responsibility frees them to be more creative.

Chapter 1 is not the only "remedial" program at Sumner, as it is at Danville. Chapter 1 serves children who range on the CTBS from the first quartile to the median. At Sumner, children in the lowest quarter or who do not meet mastery on the criterion-referenced BSAP are assigned to a "pullout" compensatory laboratory class. These children leave the classroom unit and do not receive any reading instruction from the regular teacher.

The Chapter 1 children at Sumner do not have an opinion of "Chapter 1," as do the Danville children. They know that they get "extra help" from Ms. Connor or Ms. Brandon, the aides in the second and fourth grade units, but they do not identify that "extra help" with the term "Chapter 1" or their peers' state-funded compensatory reading class. The assignments that they work on with the aide are basically extensions of the reading instruction that their regular reading teacher gives them. At Sumner the Chapter 1 program focuses on being supplementary to regular reading instruction in the sense of providing more interaction between teachers (in this case, aides) and children.

The success of Chapter 1 at Sumner seems to surprise many of the people associated with it. The choice of the "in-class" model was apparently driven by the most pragmatic of reasons. Succinctly stated, it was "more bang for the bucks." The Chapter 1 coordinator summed it up by saying, "we decided that more children served by more adults was better than a few children served by better educated adults." Thus, the administrative decision seems to have been translated into a decision that benefitted children as well.

IV. RESULTS

As can be seen from the descriptions of Danville and Sumner, the two schools included in this study do differ in many ways. However, they share many commonalities. The characteristics that this paper will compare fall into the following major categories: general characteristics of the schools; the design of Chapter 1 reading projects; and curricular and instructional characteristics of Chapter 1 reading.

A. School Characteristics

Table 1 reports several school characteristics, including community type, ethnic makeup of the student population, poverty level of the two school districts in which the two schools are located, the number of students in the district, the number of students in the school and the grade span the school enrolls. Both schools are, of course, located in South Carolina and received funds from ECIA Chapter 1. The ethnic makeup of the student populations differ widely. Danville is located within the city limits of a large city (for South Carolina) and its school district is largely urban. Thus, Danville's district is much larger in population than Sumner's which is a mixed suburban and rural district. Both schools are elementary. Danville includes a Federally funded four year old kindergarten and extends through fifth grade while Sumner begins with five year old kindergarten and extends to the fifth grade. Both schools feed into a larger "middle school."

TABLE 1

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

	DANVILLE ELEMENTARY	SUMNER ELEMENTARY
COMMUNITY TYPE	Urban	Suburban
POVERTY INDEX (District)	26%	16%
DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	28,054	10,608
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	436	849
SCHOOL ETHNIC MAKEUP		
Caucasian	10%	74%
Black	90%	23%
Asian		2%
Hispanic		1%
SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	Pre-k - 5	K - 5

B. Design of Chapter 1 reading programs

Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of the organization or design of the Chapter 1 programs at Danville and Sumner. These characteristics include 1) the grades that Chapter 1 serves; 2) the percentage of the students that Chapter 1 serves at the school; 3) the instructional delivery model; 4) the instructors that Chapter 1 funds; 5) the frequency of Chapter 1 reading; the observed length of time that children receive Chapter 1 instruction; 6) the percentage of students who fall below the median on CTBS reading; and 7) the CTBS score range targeted for Chapter 1 services. One interesting fact that emerged concerning the length of time that Chapter 1 instruction provides. The Chapter 1 district coordinator stated that children received from 20-50 minutes a day of reading instruction. In the days observed this time period ranged from 38 to 75 minutes. As stated previously, the two schools followed two different models for delivering Chapter 1 services. Danville utilized the "pullout" model sending students to a reading laboratory classroom to receive instruction from a teacher and an aide, while Sumner utilized "floating" aides who worked within the classrooms. The primary criterion used for placement in Chapter 1 in these schools seems to be norm-referenced test scores, i.e. CTBS, although teacher recommendations were also utilized in the selection process. At Danville, Chapter 1 provides the only "remedial" instructional program in reading and the Danville Chapter 1 children typically fell in the bottom quarter of CTBS reading test scores. At

Sumner, the lowest quarter typically received state funded (through EIA) compensatory reading instruction which pulled these children out to a special classroom. Chapter 1 children at Sumner typically fell in the score range from Q1 to the median.

TABLE 2

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS OF CHAPTER 1 READING

	DANVILLE ELEMENTARY	SUMNER ELEMENTARY
CHAPTER 1 GRADES	2-5	2-5
PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL SERVED BY CHAPTER 1	22%	4%
INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY	Pullout	In-class
CHAPTER 1 INSTRUCTORS	Teacher & Aide	Aide
FREQUENCY OF CHAPTER 1	4 times/ week	4 times/ week
LENGTH OF CHAPTER 1 SERVICE/DAY	38-75 minutes	20 minutes
% STUDENTS BELOW MEDIAN (CTBS reading)	57%	41%
CTBS SCORE RANGE TARGETED FOR CHAPTER 1 SERVICES	Below Q1	Q1-Q2 (median)

C. Characteristics of Reading Instruction

Despite the multitude of differences between the two schools, the Chapter 1 and regular reading instruction at Danville and Sumner can be compared on many qualities. These include time that Chapter 1 children receive reading instruction; who provides the Chapter 1 reading instruction; the type of reading lessons provided in the Chapter 1 service time; and the assignments that are given to Chapter 1 reading students. Table 3 characterizes some of these instructional qualities in Chapter 1 reading.

The children at Sumner received, on average, approximately 110 minutes of reading instruction on the days observed. Twenty-one minutes of this instructional time was Chapter 1 service with the Chapter 1 aide being the instructor exclusively in that time period. At Danville the children received a longer time span in reading, approximately 145 minutes on the days observed. The average Chapter 1 class was 50 minutes long. At Danville, the Chapter 1 reading instructors provided instruction 73% of the time in Chapter 1 while the Chapter 1 aide was the identified instructor 23% of the Chapter 1 service time. Occasionally, at Danville, (7% of observed time) the regular reading teacher would provide instruction during a Chapter 1 service time period.

In this study, <u>instruction</u> was characterized into five different categories of lesson format. The first format was "lecture / recitation." In this format, the instructor and the students would be

verbally interacting in some way. Therefore, teachers' direct instruction and question/answer sessions were coded as this format. The second format was "seatwork." In this format, students would be given assignments to perform and there would be a time allocated in class to do these tasks. At times the teacher would interact with individuals or roam the classroom trying to assess whether students were having difficulty with the assignment. Other times the teacher would sit at her desk doing other tasks while the students did the seatwork. "Surrogate" instruction occurred when a device such as a listening center, a mechanical teaching machine or a computer was used by the student. Television and films were also considered "surrogates." Management included instructional time not directly related to reading. This time ranged from disciplinary breaks to passing out and collecting papers. Finally "other" referred to instructional time that the teacher was not engaging the student in any meaningful activity. Informal class conversations and visits from other teachers to get materials were coded as other. Testing was not considered instructional time, although it was included in the estimates of Chapter 1 service minutes if the child was tested by Chapter 1 funded staff.

At Sumner, all but a very small proportion of the Chapter 1 instructional time (which was variously distributed) was spent in the format of lecture/recitation. The Chapter 1 aide would spend the twenty minutes she spent with the students engaging them in dialogue

about the skills that the regular classroom teacher had introduced to them. As previously stated, the aide functioned basically in a tutoring role, trying to get the students to understand the skill. Typically she would question the children and either have another child correct any mistakes a child would make in responding or correct the student herself. At Danville, the lesson format was much more varied. Here the lecture/recitation was the format for over half of the service minutes. A majority of those minutes were the Chapter 1 teacher's. The aides would, at times, engage the students in the lecture or recitation but they would supervise most of the seatwork minutes, which composed 18% of the Chapter 1 service minutes at Danville. The listening stations and computers in Danville's Chapter 1 reading laboratory classrooms accounted for 10% of the service time provided by Chapter 1. Management which was 6% of the time at Danville typically included shifting groups and the distribution and collection of papers. The lesson format breakdown is summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3

INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CHAPTER 1 READING

	DANVILLE	SUMNER
OBSERVED DAYS/WEEK SCHEDULE	4	4
AVERAGE SERVICE MINUTES PER SERVICE DAY	50.1	21.3
% INSTRUCTOR TIME IN CHAPTER 1 MINUTES		
Chapter 1 teacher	73%	-0-
Chapter 1 aide	20%	100%
Regular teacher	7%	-0-
% CHAPTER 1 MINUTES IN DIFFERENT LESSON FORMATS		
Lecture/Recitation	65%	94%
Seatwork	18%	•
Management	6%	•
Surrogate	10%	•
AVERAGE CHAPTER 1 GROUP SIZE	6.6	3.7

Note: • means less than 1% of observed time.

The Chapter 1 instruction was delivered to small groups at Danville and at Sumner. At Sumner, the average group size in Chapter 1 reading instruction was 3.7. At Danville, the groups averaged larger but of course the student load at Danville was much larger as well. The average group size for Chapter 1 reading at Danville was 6.6. Since class size is a factor in effective instruction (Cooper, 1986) Chapter 1 seemed to be fulfilling its avowed purpose.

Both Chapter 1 programs shared a common instructional pattern in that the students in Chapter 1 were given instruction and practices in reading skills. The skills orientation was shared by all Chapter 1 reading instruction. The skills were for the most part low level rather than "higher order" thinking skills. Literal comprehension was perhaps the most emphasized. Questions like "What happened in the paragraph?" or "What is the main idea?" seemed prevalent. Word attack skills were also a common area of emphasis particularly in the second grade Chapter 1 instruction observed. This emphasis parallels the findings of Durkin (1979) in observing elementary reading classes. Although the basal reader itself was not used in the Danville's reading laboratory classroom, the skills activities were related to the basal series' scope and sequence and the Chapter 1 children's progress through the basal. At Sumner the basal reader was typically the source of the students' activities.

Chapter 1 is defined by its charter as "supplementary" instruction. The nature of the supplementing seemed very much tied to the assignments that Chapter 1 students completed in their Chapter 1 classes. As Anderson (1987) points out, instruction in Chapter 1 seems to be driven by the assignments, the tasks students must perform.

At Danville, the Chapter 1 teacher or the Chapter 1 aide assigns tasks to the Chapter 1 students. The tasks are a part of a lesson typically designed and delivered by the Chapter 1 teacher, perhaps after consulting the regular reading teacher. The Chapter 1 lessons may attempt to keep pace with the regular reading program but they may not maintain the same pace throughout the year. The Chapter 1 lessons and assignments may come from various sources including supplementary instructional materials purchased by Chapter 1. The Chapter 1 reading teachers and the regular reading teachers coordinate their instruction by means of written forms and notes; occasional meetings and informal conversations (over the lunch table, for example).

At Sumner, the assignments are designed as a part of the regular reading lesson and are made by the regular classroom teacher. The assignments are done by the students with the assistance of the Chapter 1 aide. The assignments are derived from the basal reading series although extra materials may at times be used. The coordination between regular and Chapter 1 reading instruction consists of the regular classroom teacher giving the Chapter 1 aide a written lesson plan and brief verbal exchanges between the two.

V. DISCUSSION

This study is an effort to portray "what is"; as a result, it shares the common limitations of all observational and qualitative research. However, what it has to offer is relevant to all educators and researchers. The rich detail allowed the researchers to discern more about the reality of schools in the day-to-day efforts to help students learn. It is a snapshot of the actual instructional practices in the schools of South Carolina and, perhaps, the Deep South.

Much research in reading comprehension has focused on intervention studies in which alternate methods of instruction have been introduced into reading classrooms and their efficacy has been tested. There are, however, many approaches to reading instruction that are present in schools that are not based on research findings or teacher education programs (Durkin, 1979). These may be the products of classroom teachers' experience or of the administrative arrangements associated with the reading program. Certainly the Chapter 1 assignment pattern at Sumner and Danville is associated with the instructional delivery model of Chapter 1 and the way that the program is managed. The concentration on skills reinforcement for Chapter 1 children is a product of what teachers and administration see as the pressing need for these children, but it may in part be derived from the basal reading series providing the overall structure to reading instruction at both schools.

VI. REFERENCES

Anderson, Lorin W. and Pigford, Aretha (1987). When assignments drive Chapter 1 Instruction. Paper presented at the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Cooper, H.M. (1986). Chapter 1 programs reduce student-to-instructor ratios but do reduced ratios affect achievement? Paper prepared for the Conference on Effects of Alternative Design in Compensatory Education, Washington, D.C.

Durkin, D. (1979). What classroom observation says about reading comprehension instruction. Reading Research Quarterly 14. pp. 481-533.

Rowan, Brian, Guthrie, L., Guthrie, G.P., and Lee, G.V. (1987). Organization and Implementation of Chapter 1 Programs: Lessons from 24 Schools. Far West Laboratory of Research and Development. (Report to the Department of Education)